Ethical Imaginationism

Samuel Richard Hernandez JR.

2026

On Ethical Imaginationism

Ethical Imaginationism emerges from a contradiction that has been quietly normalized in contemporary art: works are routinely treated as ethically meaningful while the act of viewing them is treated as ethically neutral.

This contradiction allows ethical weight to be carried by representation, expression, symbolism, or intention, while spectatorship remains exempt from consequence. The viewer may feel, interpret, critique, or disagree, but is rarely positioned as ethically present. Meaning is produced, but responsibility is deferred.

Ethical Imaginationism does not propose a new moral stance, political alignment, or aesthetic style. It does not argue for better ethics, clearer values, or correct interpretation. Instead, it removes the structural assumption that looking is neutral and examines what remains once that assumption can no longer be relied upon.

When this neutrality is removed, familiar solutions begin to fail. Explanation no longer resolves ethical tension. Symbolism no longer substitutes for responsibility. Emotional intensity no longer functions as moral proof. Narrative closure no longer provides ethical relief. The viewer is no longer protected by interpretation.

In Ethical Imaginationism, omission is not absence but structure. What is withheld must matter. What is not shown must exert pressure. Ethical force arises not from what the work declares, but from where responsibility is allowed to disappear—and where it is not.

The role of the viewer changes accordingly. The viewer is not a witness, judge, or interpreter standing outside the work. The viewer is

positioned within a condition that does not instruct, persuade, or resolve. Agreement is irrelevant. Understanding is insufficient. The ethical demand persists regardless of response.

Ethical Imaginationism does not seek universality. It does not claim that all art must operate ethically, nor that ethical pressure improves all work. Many works benefit from expression, narration, symbolism, or explanation. Ethical Imaginationism remains deliberately limited, because its coherence depends on restraint.

Failure is admissible within the framework. A work may fail Ethical Imaginationism without invalidating it. In fact, the ability to fail is essential: if every work could be retrofitted to qualify, the framework would collapse into taste or ideology.

Ethical Imaginationism is therefore not a movement in the stylistic sense, nor a doctrine to be adopted. It is a structural intervention that alters how responsibility is distributed between artwork and viewer. Once articulated, it does not require acceptance to function. It only requires recognition of the contradiction it removes.

What follows from that recognition—resistance, rejection, misuse, indifference, or transformation—belongs to time and to others. Ethical Imaginationism does not attempt to manage those outcomes. It exists to let the consequences stand.